

# **REMARKS**

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application. However, in the view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of the present application.

By the foregoing amendment, claims 52-55 and claim 66 have been canceled. In addition, claims 52-54 have been presented as new claims 72-74, which depend from claim 56. In addition, claims 57-60, 63, and 65 have been amended so that they now depend from claim 56, instead of claim 52. Claims 59, 64, and 69 have been amended to change "proportion" to "fraction".

## **Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. §112:**

Claims 58 and 69 have been have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. The Examiner alleges that it is unclear what is meant by "at least a proportion  $y$  of the boundary" and " $y > 0.5$ ". It is assumed that the Examiner is referring to claims 59 and 69. For purposes of clarification, those claims have been amended to change the term "proportion" to "fraction". Thus, it should now be clear that the core boundary has a thickness  $t$  around at least a fraction  $y$  of the boundary, where  $y$  is greater than 0.5. In other words, the core boundary has a thickness  $t$  around at least greater than one-half of the boundary. See page 18, lines 4-11.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing amendments and explanation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 58 and 69.

Claims 56 and 67-71 have been rejected as being allegedly indefinite. The Examiner alleges that it is unclear what is meant by "F-factor". The Examiner further alleges that the term has not been properly defined either within the specification or within the claim. However, the Examiner's attention is directed to the specification beginning at page 14, line 29 through page 16, line 18, and in particular, equation 9 on page 16. In that section of the specification, F-factor is clearly and specifically defined. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 56 and 67-71.

Claim 63 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. The Examiner alleges it is unclear what is meant by  $t > u\Lambda$  for a portion of the boundary  $y$ , where  $u > 0.06$  and  $y > 0.5$ . It is assumed that the Examiner is referring to claim 64, not claim 63. With regard to the variable  $y$ , claim 64 has been amended to clarify that  $y$  stands for the fraction discussed therein. With regard to  $u$ ,  $u$  is a number representing the proportion of  $\Lambda$  that constitutes  $t$ . Accordingly,  $u$  does not have any units, and does not require any definition. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 63 (64) is now definite.

**Art Rejection:**

Claim 66 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,778,749, hereinafter Allan. In response to that rejection, claim 66 has been canceled.

Claims 52-54 and 57-65 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Allan. In response to that rejection, claims 52-54

have been canceled and claims 57-65 now depend from claim 56. Claim 56 has not been rejected over the prior art. Accordingly, claim 56, together with dependent claims 57-65 are patentable over Allan.

To further define the protection to which Applicants are entitled, claims 52-54 have been rewritten as dependent claims 72-74, each of which depends from claim 56. Accordingly, the new dependent claims are patentable at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 56.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections and to find the application to be in condition for allowance.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this response, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: August 6, 2007

By:



William C. Rowland  
Registration No. 30888

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620